<u>Vision Group D-System Review and Data</u> Meeting Minutes for May 19, 2000 10-3p Host Hotel, Sacramento

I. Introduction:

- A. <u>Members Present</u>: Steve Andriese, Michael Frenn, Reggie Chapelle, Bobbi Bonnet, Kristy Harlen, Bonnie Sinz, Dave Yogel, Tella Williams, Ed Armitage, Charla Jensen, Craig Stroup, Karl Sporer, Bob Eisenman, Bob O'Brien, Kim Kirkpatrick, Jim Schneider.
- B. EMSA Staff Present: Miranda Swanson, Mercia Brandon.
- C. <u>Discussion</u>: An updated membership list was distributed.
 - -Vendors are not allowed on the list server, but meetings are open unless otherwise specified.
 - -List server replies should be directed to original sender unless the subject matter of the reply directly affects the group.

II. Approval of Minutes:

A. Meeting minutes from the March 17, 2000 meeting were approved as amended.

III. Business Items:

Alternatives to Conference Calls

- A. <u>Summary</u>: Ed suggested internet conference calls.
 - -Calls only require microphone, speaker phone, and sound card.
 - -Net to phone is approximately \$0.01 per minute.
 - -While speaking, one can also type in messages.
 - -Ed will look into it more before the next meeting.

Updates on Constituency Groups and Endorsement Letters

A. Summary: Some constituent letters of agreement have already been received from:

CSAC

EMSAAC

CAA

OSHPD

- -More letters are coming.
- -The Big 5 has pretty much reached consensus on the action plan.
- -CHA feels the plan would have to be cost neutral. It is difficult for them to support additional costs for hospitals.

Review of Proposed Revisions to the Final Action Plan by Constituency Groups

A. Summary: No revisions suggested.

Progress Updates on Objectives Due for Completion by July 2000

- **1.** Work Group **D** Steve Andriese
 - A. Summary: Objective #1 To develop an evaluation process for EMS Authority and

local EMS Agencies - has not yet been assigned.

- -A draft of assessment guidelines was sent out with a request for comments.
- -The group decided that EMS agencies should be evaluated in some way, mandatorily, every five years.
- -There is concern about the cost for some agencies. It is decided that funding must be addressed.
- -Group discussed system evaluation versus agency evaluation.

1.5 State EMS Authority Responsibilities

-Group is compiling drafts of final reports. They will then be assessed to determine workability.

1.6 Assessment Panel Membership

- -Question of how expenses will be paid.
- -Group discussed who would be on the panel. No consensus as reached.

1.7 Assessment Panel Responsibilities

-It was suggested that the panel should also use the NHTSA Report from CA assessment and Vision Document to maintain consistency.

Chapter 2 Assessment Tools

- -Annual Organizational and Financial Report of Local EMS Agencies in California was handed out and reviewed.
- -Group is to review document and get comments back to Steve in 2 weeks. Group is looking at the format and not the data. Due by June 2, 2000.
- -Steve wants to develop a draft to send to EMSAAC with local EMS system guidelines.
- -These too will be sent to the group for comment and returned also by June 2, 2000, to be sent to EMSAAC for review.

2. Subgroup 1 - Jim Schneider

- A. <u>Summary</u>: 2.1 and 3.6 are due coming up quickly.
 - -2.1.1 and 2.1.2 have been completed.
 - -There are security issues with the data, as well as privacy issues.

3. Ad Hoc Group - Bonnie Sinz

- A. <u>Summary</u>: A small group of agencies was put together, including Mountain Valley, Marin, San Mateo, Monterey, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Fresno/Kings/Madera.
 - -Members have already met for the first time.
 - -Their objective is to help out Subgroup 1.
 - -The group is working at putting together dictionaries with definitions of data elements. They are looking at commonalities, pulling together raw data to create data wherehouses. The group is also experimenting with languages.
- B. Action Items: Group is to meet again in July.
 - -The next step is to put the data together in the wherehouses, and figuring out what

PSAPS should be evaluated by.

- -Bonnie handed out a flowchart plotting areas in which data is currently available.
- -Group is to review it and provide feedback.

4. Subgroup 2 - *Craig Stroup*

- A. Summary: Group is trying to figure out what to do with the data.
 - -An inventory of indicators has been developed.
 - -10 steps were defined.
 - -Main objectives are to:
 - 1) Ask the questions
 - 2) Define the answers (create indicators)
 - 3) Go get the data

5. Subgroup 3 - Bonnie Sinz

- A. <u>Summary</u>: A draft of the bullet points is under construction and will be distributed both to this group and the lead group.
 - -These will be ready by the July due date.

Questions to be Answered - Training

A. Summary:

Programs:

EMT-I & II

EMT-P

EMT-D/AED

CE Provider

MICN

CPR/First Aid

Child Care

=SCOPE

EMT-P:

Pass/Fail Rates (National Registry)

Attrition Rate

Enrollment/Demographics

Experience Before Program

Program Hours

Time Intervals, Internship, etc.

Type of Program

Cost per Student

Skills Completed

Employer Pay

Meeting Evaluation

Good.

Next Meeting
July 14 at the EMS Authority